

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are presently active; Claims 1 and 10 have been presently amended.

In the Office Action dated March 16, 2005. Claims 1 and 10 were objected to. Claims 1-6, 9-15, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bohn (U.S. Pat. No. 6,033,086) in view of Miyashita et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,604,606). Claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 19, and 20 were objected to for being dependent from a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Firstly, regarding the objection to the claims, Claims 1 and 10 have been amended as suggested in the outstanding Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the objection to the claims has been overcome.

Secondly, Applicants respectfully submit that Bohn discloses a technique related to a compact illumination system including multiple reflectors in order to improve uniformity and efficiency of illumination. Meanwhile, Miyashita et al disclose a technique for preventing deterioration of image focusing performance by preventing unnecessary flaring light from a contact glass and a document from entering an image focusing optical system. Neither Bohn nor Miyashita et al disclose or suggest appropriately setting a balance in the quantity of light between direct light from a light source and light reflected from an auxiliary reflector, as permitted in the present invention, in order to eliminate shade generated in an original in the case of employing an auxiliary reflector.¹

The Office Action indicates that Miyashita et al disclose a light-blocking member (light-blocking means) according to Claims 1 and 10 of the present invention. However, since

¹ Specification, page 5, lines 19-22.

Miyashita et al do not disclose a configuration employing a reflecting member, Miyashita et al do not disclose a light-blocking member that blocks the first illuminating light portion reflected from the reflecting member, as defined in independent Claims 1 and 10. That is, Miyashita et al fail to disclose the light-blocking member of the present invention.

For instance, the light shield layer 4 illustrated in Figure 3 of Miyashita et al, which the Office Action associates with the light-blocking member of the present invention, serves to reduce or eliminate undesired light reflected from the contact glass surface or light reflected from the document through the contact glass 3. (See, column 5, lines 16-18). Thus, the light shield layer 4 of Miyashita et al does not block light reflected from a reflecting member.

Considering the above, it is believed that even if the technique disclosed in Bohn is combined with the technique disclosed in Miyashita et al, it is not possible to eliminate shade generated in an original by appropriately setting a balance in the quantity of light between direct light auxiliary reflector, as permitted in the present invention by the defined light-blocking member provided between the light source and the object of illumination, and between the reflecting member and the object of illumination so as to block at least a part of both the first and second illuminating light portions with a certain ratio of a light-blocking rate for the first illuminating light portion to a light-blocking rate for the second illuminating portion of the illuminating light.

Hence, with no feature in Miyashita et al comparable to the above-noted light-blocking member, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom patentably define over the applied prior art.

Application No. 10/612,933
Response to Office Action of March 16, 2005


Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
GJM:RAR:clh



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.
Registration No. 45,618

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\239's\239804USAM2.DOC